1 2 3 4 5	LAW OFFICES OF DALE K. GALIPO Dale K. Galipo, Esq. (Bar No. 144074) dalekgalipo@yahoo.com Hang D. Le, Esq. (Bar No. 293450) hlee@galipolaw.com 21800 Burbank Boulevard, Suite 310 Woodland Hills, California, 91367 Telephone: (818) 347-3333 Facsimile: (818) 347-4118	
6 7	Attorneys for Plaintiffs L.C., I.H., A.L., and Antonia Salas Ubaldo	0
8	LINITED STATES DIST	RICT COURT FOR THE
9		CT OF CALIFORNIA
<ul><li>10</li><li>11</li></ul>	L.C., a minor by and through her	Case No. 5:22-cv-00949-KK-SHK
12	guardian <i>ad litem</i> Maria Cadena, individually and as successor-in-interest	Honorable Kenly Kiya Kato
13	to Hector Puga; I.H., a minor by and through his guardian <i>ad litem</i> Jasmine	AMENDED JOINT EXHIBIT
14	Hernandez, individually and as	STIPULATON
15	successor-in-interest to Hector Puga; A.L., a minor by and through her	
16	guardian <i>ad litem</i> Lydia Lopez,	
17	individually and as successor-in-interest to Hector Puga; and ANTONIA SALAS	
18	UBALDO, individually;	
19	Plaintiffs,	
20	VS.	
21	STATE OF CALIFORNIA; COUNTY	
22	OF SAN BERNARDINO; S.S.C., a nominal defendant; ISAIAH KEE;	
23	MICHAEL BLACKWOOD;	
24	BERNARDO RUBALCAVA; ROBERT VACCARI; JAKE ADAMS; and DOES	
25	6-10, inclusive,	
26	Defendants.	
26 27		

## TO THE HONORABLE COURT, ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

Pursuant to the Court's Civil Trial Scheduling Order, Plaintiffs L	C., a minor		
All barrend the manufacture of t			
4 by and through her guardian <i>ad litem</i> Maria Cadena; I.H., a minor by an	by and through her guardian ad litem Maria Cadena; I.H., a minor by and through		
5 his guardian <i>ad litem</i> Jasmine Hernandez; A.L., a minor by and through	her		
6 guardian <i>ad litem</i> Lydia Lopez; and Antonia Salas Ubaldo ("Plaintiffs")	) and		
7 Defendants State of California, by and through the California Highway	Patrol,		
8 Michael Blackwood, Isaiah Kee, and Bernardo Rubalcava ("State Defendant of the Company of the	ndants"),		
9 (collectively "the Parties"), hereby submit this Joint Exhibit Stipulation	for the June		
10 2, 2025 trial.			
11			
12 DATED: May 15, 2025 LAW OFFICES OF DALE K. GA	LIPO		
13			
By /s/ Hang D. Le			
Dale K. Galino	_		
Attorneys for Plaintiffs			
17			
18 DATED: May 15, 2025 ROB BONTA Attorney General of California			
NORMAN D. MORRISON Supervising Deputy Attorney Ger	neral		
20			
21 /s/ Diana Esquivel*			
DIANA ESQUIVEL Deputy Attorney General			
Attorneys for Defendant State of C	Cal., by and		
24 Rubalcava	c, cirta		
25 *The filer Hang D. Le hereby attests that all other signatories listed as	nd on whose		
behalf the filing is submitted, concur with the filing's content and have			
27 the filing.			
28			
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	his guardian ad litem Jasmine Hernandez; A.L., a minor by and through guardian ad litem Lydia Lopez; and Antonia Salas Ubaldo ("Plaintiffs")  Defendants State of California, by and through the California Highway Michael Blackwood, Isaiah Kee, and Bernardo Rubalcava ("State Defer (collectively "the Parties"), hereby submit this Joint Exhibit Stipulation 2, 2025 trial.  DATED: May 15, 2025  LAW OFFICES OF DALE K. GA  BV /s/ Hang D. Le  Attorneys for Plaintiffs  DATED: May 15, 2025  ROB BONTA Attorneys for Plaintiffs  DATED: May 15, 2025  ROB BONTA Attorney General of California NORMAN D. MORRISON Supervising Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Defendant State of California Attorneys for California Attorneys for California Norman State of California Norman		

## **JOINT EXHIBIT STIPULATION**

2	Exhibit	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to
3 4	No.			Authenticity and Foundation
5	***	PLAINTIFFS' EXHIBIT LIST	***	***
6	1.	Part 4 of MVARS Video from	None.	Yes.
7	1.	Michael Blackwood's Patrol Unit (COSB0001465)	Tione.	105.
8	2.	Part 2 of MVARS Video from	None.	Yes.
9 10		Isaiah Kee's Patrol Unit (COSB009200)		
	3.	Cellphone Video of Incident from	None.	Yes.
11		Witness Erin Mangerino (COSB001470)		
12	4.	Cellphone Video of Incident from	None	Yes.
13	4.	Witness Betzabeth Gonzalez	None.	1 cs.
14		(Plaintiff 0241)		
15	5.	Cellphone Video of Incident from	None.	Yes.
16		Witness Betzabeth Gonzalez (Plaintiff 0256)		
17	6.	Cellphone Video of Incident from	None.	Yes.
18		Witness Betzabeth Gonzalez (Plaintiff 0257)		
19	7.	Cellphone Video of Incident from	None	Yes.
20	/.	Witness Betzabeth Gonzalez	None.	103.
21		(Plaintiff 0258)		
22	8.	Cellphone Clip of Incident from	None.	Yes.
23		Witness Edward Mangerino (COSB001453)		
24	9.	Cellphone Clip of Incident from	None.	Yes.
25		Witness Edward Mangerino		
26		(COSB001454)		
27	10.	Cellphone Clip of Incident from Witness Edward Mangerino	None.	Yes.
28		(COSB001455)		
20				3

-2-

1	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Description</b>	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
2	No.			Authenticity
3				and Foundation
5	11.	Cellphone Clip of Incident from Witness Edward Mangerino (COSB001456)	None.	Yes.
6 7 8	12.	Cellphone Clip of Incident from Witness Edward Mangerino (COSB001457)	None.	Yes.
9	13.	Cellphone Clip of Incident from Witness Edward Mangerino (COSB001458)	None.	Yes.
11 12	14.	Cellphone Clip of Incident from Witness Edward Mangerino (COSB001459)	None.	Yes.
13 14	15.	Cellphone Clip of Incident from Witness Edward Mangerino (COSB001460)	None.	Yes.
15 16 17	16.	Cellphone Clip of Incident from Witness Edward Mangerino (COSB001461)	None.	Yes.
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	17.	Plaintiffs' Expert Matthew Kimmins' Puga Compilation Video	Lacks foundation, calls for speculation, and improper expert opinion. Fed. R. Evid. 702. See Defs.' Mot. In Limine No. 1.  Plaintiffs' Response: The Court has ruled that this Exhibit be played as a demonstrative so long	No.
27 28			as the captions are edited out.	

	<b>-</b>			
1	Exhibit No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
2	<u>No.</u>			and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4	18.	Plaintiffs' Expert Matthew Kimmins' Post Fall Bullet Count	Lacks foundation,	No.
5		Video	calls for speculation, and improper expert	
6			opinion. Fed. R. Evid. 702. <i>See</i> Defs.' Mot.	Defs.' Reply: The Court
7			In Limine No. 1.	ruled that "the
8				captions must be edited out of
9			Plaintiffs' Response:	the videos,"
10			The Court has ruled that this Exhibit may	(ECF No. 185 at 3), which
11			be played as a	necessary
12			demonstrative.	includes the purported
13				bullet count
14				that the witness added to the
15				video.
16	19.	Audio Recording of Interview of Isaiah Kee (COSB001350)	Relevance, cumulative, waste	Yes if deemed admissible.
17			time, and hearsay. Fed.	ddimssiore.
18 19			R. Evid. 401-403, 802, 805.	
20				
21			Plaintiffs' Response:	
22			Kee's interview regarding the incident,	
23			given to detectives	
24			days after the incident are relevant as it is	
25			closest in time	
26			recollection of the events, differs in some	
27			important details to his	
28			testimony given later, and may also be used	
-			and may and be able	

1	<b>Exhibit</b>	Description	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$	No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	<b>Authenticity</b>
				and
3			to the second West	<b>Foundation</b>
4			to impeach Kee's testimony. Moreover,	
5			the recording is not	
6			hearsay because it is a party-opponent's	
7			statement. Fed. R.	
8			Evid. 801(d)(2).	
9	20.	Audio Recording of Interview of Isaiah Kee (COSB001373)	Relevance, cumulative, waste	Yes if deemed admissible.
10		Isalah Rec (COSBOO1373)	time, and hearsay. Fed.	
11			R. Evid. 401-403, 802,	
12			805.	
13			Plaintiffs' Response: Kee's interview	
14			regarding the incident,	
15			given to detectives days after the incident	
16			are relevant as it is	
17			closest in time recollection of the	
18			events, differs in some	
19			important details to his	
20			testimony given later, and may also be used	
21			to impeach Kee's	
22			testimony. Moreover, the recording is not	
23			hearsay because it is a	
24			party-opponent's statement. Fed. R.	
25			Evid. 801(d)(2).	
26	21.	Audio Recording of Interview of	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
		Isaiah Kee (COSB001374)	cumulative, waste time, and hearsay. Fed.	admissible.
27		<u> </u>	ume, and nearsay. Ped.	

1	Exhibit	Description	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
2	No.			Authenticity
3				and Foundation
4			R. Evid. 401-403, 802,	<u> 1 oundulon</u>
5			805.	
			Plaintiffs' Response:	
6			Kee's interview	
7			regarding the incident, given to detectives	
8			days after the incident	
9			are relevant as it is	
10			closest in time recollection of the	
11			events, differs in some	
12			important details to his testimony given later,	
13			and may also be used	
14			to impeach Kee's	
15			testimony. Moreover, the recording is not	
			hearsay because it is a	
16			party-opponent's	
17			statement. Fed. R. Evid. 801(d)(2).	
18	22.	Audio Recording of Interview of	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
19	22.	Isaiah Kee (COSB001375)	cumulative, waste	admissible.
20			time, and hearsay. Fed.	
21			R. Evid. 401-403, 802, 805.	
22			Plaintiffs' Response:	
23			Kee's interview	
24			regarding the incident, given to detectives	
25			days after the incident	
26			are relevant as it is	
			closest in time recollection of the	
27			events, differs in some	
28				

1	Exhibit	Description	Objection/ Response	Stinulation to
	No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
2				and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4			important details to his	
5			testimony given later, and may also be used	
6			to impeach Kee's	
7			testimony. Moreover,	
8			the recording is not hearsay because it is a	
9			party-opponent's	
10			statement. Fed. R.	
	22	Deposit and Tuong spirition of	Evid. 801(d)(2).	No
11	23.	Report and Transcription of Interview of Isaiah Kee	Relevance, cumulative, waste	No.
12		(COSB000648-729)	time, hearsay, and	D f 1 D 1
13			lacks foundation and	Defs.' Reply: The report and
14			authenticity. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403, 602,	transcription
15			802, 805, 901.	are someone
16			Plaintiffs' Response:	else's interpretation
17			Kee's interview regarding the incident,	of what Kee
18			given to detectives	allegedly stated during his
19			days after the incident	interview.
20			are relevant as it is closest in time	Further, the accuracy of the
21			recollection of the	transcription is
22			events, differs in some important details to his	unknown and
23			testimony given later,	unverified. The documents are
			and may also be used to impeach Kee's	therefore
24			testimony. Moreover,	inadmissible
25			the recording is not	hearsay and lack
26			hearsay because it is a	authentication.
27			party-opponent's	

1	TC-1.21.24	D	Ol.:4:/ D	C4*1-4*4-
1	Exhibit No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
2	<u> </u>			and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4   5			statement. Fed. R. Evid. 801(d)(2).	
6	24.	Audio Recording of Interview of	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
7		Bernardo Rubalcava (COSB001353)	cumulative, waste time, and hearsay. Fed.	admissible.
		(COSD001333)	R. Evid. 401-403, 802,	
8			805.	
9			Plaintiffs' Response:	
10			Rubalcava's interview regarding the incident,	
11			given to detectives	
12			days after the incident are relevant as it is	
13			closest in time	
14			recollection of the	
15			events, differs in some important details to his	
16			testimony given later,	
17			and may also be used to impeach	
18			Rubalcava's	
19			testimony. Moreover,	
20			the recording is not hearsay because it is a	
21			party-opponent's	
22			statement. Fed. R. Evid. 801(d)(2).	
	25.	Audio Recording of Interview of	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
23	25.	Bernardo Rubalcava	cumulative, waste	admissible.
24		(COSB001354)	time, and hearsay. Fed.	
25			R. Evid. 401-403, 802, 805.	
26			Plaintiffs' Response:	
27			Rubalcava's interview	
28			regarding the incident,	

1	<b>Exhibit</b>	Description	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
$\begin{vmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{vmatrix}$	<u>No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	<b>Authenticity</b>
3				and Foundation
4			given to detectives	Toundation
5			days after the incident	
			are relevant as it is closest in time	
6 7			recollection of the	
			events, differs in some	
8			important details to his testimony given later,	
9			and may also be used	
10			to impeach Rubalcava's	
11			testimony. Moreover,	
12			the recording is not hearsay because it is a	
13			party-opponent's	
14			statement. Fed. R.	
15	26	A 1:- D 1:	Evid. 801(d)(2).	Yes if deemed
16	26.	Audio Recording of Interview of Bernardo Rubalcava	Relevance, cumulative, waste	admissible.
17		(COSB001370)	time, and hearsay. Fed.	
18			R. Evid. 401-403, 802, 805.	
19			Plaintiffs' Response:	
20			Rubalcava's interview	
21			regarding the incident, given to detectives	
22			days after the incident	
23			are relevant as it is closest in time	
24			recollection of the	
25			events, differs in some important details to his	
26			testimony given later,	
27			and may also be used to impeach	
28			Rubalcava's	

$_{1}\Vert$	<b>Exhibit</b>	Description	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to
$_{2}$	No.		<u> </u>	Authenticity
3				and Foundation
4			testimony. Moreover,	
5			the recording is not hearsay because it is a	
6			party-opponent's	
7			statement. Fed. R. Evid. 801(d)(2).	
8	27.	Audio Recording of Interview of	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
9		Bernardo Rubalcava	cumulative, waste	admissible.
10		(COSB001371)	time, and hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403, 802,	
11			805.	
12			Plaintiffs' Response: Rubalcava's interview	
13			regarding the incident,	
14			given to detectives	
15			days after the incident are relevant as it is	
16			closest in time	
17			recollection of the events, differs in some	
18			important details to his	
19			testimony given later, and may also be used	
20			to impeach	
21			Rubalcava's	
22			testimony. Moreover, the recording is not	
23			hearsay because it is a	
24			party-opponent's statement. Fed. R.	
25			Evid. 801(d)(2).	
26	28.	Audio Recording of Interview of Bernardo Rubalcava	Relevance, cumulative, waste	Yes if deemed admissible.
27		(COSB001372)	time, and hearsay. Fed.	admissible.
28				

-10-

1	Tr1-91-94	Description	Objection/Demo	C4:104:4
1	Exhibit No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
2	<u> </u>			and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4			R. Evid. 401-403, 802,	
5			805.	
6			Plaintiffs' Response:	
7			Rubalcava's interview regarding the incident,	
			given to detectives	
8			days after the incident	
9			are relevant as it is	
10			closest in time recollection of the	
11			events, differs in some	
12			important details to his	
			testimony given later,	
13			and may also be used to impeach	
14			Rubalcava's	
15			testimony. Moreover,	
16			the recording is not	
17			hearsay because it is a party-opponent's	
			statement. Fed. R.	
18			Evid. 801(d)(2).	
19	29.	Report and Transcription of	Relevance,	No.
20		Interview of Bernardo Rubalcava	cumulative, waste	
21		(COSB000396-540)	time, hearsay, and lacks foundation and	Defs.' Reply:
22			authenticity. Fed. R.	The report and
23			Evid. 401-403, 602,	transcription are someone
			802, 805, 901.	else's
24			Plaintiffs' Response:	interpretation
25			Rubalcava's interview regarding the incident,	of what
26			given to detectives	Rubalcava allegedly stated
27			days after the incident	during his
28			are relevant as it is	interview.

1	<b>Exhibit</b>	Description	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to
$\begin{vmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{vmatrix}$	<u>No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	<b>Authenticity</b>
3				and Foundation
4			closest in time	Further, the
5			recollection of the	accuracy of the
6			events, differs in some important details to his	•
7			testimony given later,	unverified. The
8			and may also be used to impeach	documents are therefore
9			Rubalcava's	inadmissible
			testimony. Moreover,	hearsay and lack
10			the recording is not hearsay because it is a	authentication.
11			party-opponent's	
12			statement. Fed. R. Evid. 801(d)(2).	
13	30.	Audio Recording of Interview of	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
14		Michael Blackwood	cumulative, waste	admissible.
15		(COSB001351)	time, and hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403, 802,	
16			805.	
17			Plaintiffs' Response:	
18			Blackwood's	
19			interview regarding the incident, given to	
20			detectives days after	
21			the incident are relevant as it is closest	
22			in time recollection of	
23			the events, differs in some important details	
24			to his testimony given	
25			later, and may also be	
26			used to impeach Blackwood's	
27			testimony. Moreover,	
28			the recording is not hearsay because it is a	
40			mearsay because it is a	

-12-

1	Exhibit No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
3				and Foundation
5			party-opponent's statement. Fed. R. Evid. 801(d)(2).	
6 7 8 9	31.	Audio Recording of Interview of Michael Blackwood (COSB001355)	Relevance, cumulative, waste time, and hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403, 802, 805.	Yes if deemed admissible.
10			Plaintiffs' Response: Blackwood's	
11 12			interview regarding the incident, given to	
13			detectives days after the incident are	
14			relevant as it is closest in time recollection of	
15 16			the events, differs in some important details	
17			to his testimony given later, and may also be	
18			used to impeach Blackwood's	
19			testimony. Moreover,	
20   21			the recording is not hearsay because it is a	
22			party-opponent's statement. Fed. R.	
23	32.	Report and Transcription of	Evid. 801(d)(2). Relevance,	No.
<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>		Interview of Michael Blackwood (COSB000542-646)	cumulative, waste time, hearsay, and	
26		(00000012010)	lacks foundation and authenticity. Fed. R.	Defs.' Reply: The report and
27 28			Evid. 401-403, 602, 802, 805, 901.	transcription are someone

1	<b>Exhibit</b>	Description	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
2	No.			Authenticity
3				and Foundation
4			Plaintiffs' Response:	else's
5			Blackwood's	interpretation of what
6			interview regarding the incident, given to	Blackwood
7			detectives days after	allegedly stated
8			the incident are relevant as it is closest	during his
9			in time recollection of	Further, the
			the events, differs in	accuracy of the
10			some important details to his testimony given	transcription is unknown and
11			later, and may also be	unverified. The
12			used to impeach Blackwood's	documents are therefore
13			testimony. Moreover,	inadmissible
14			the recording is not	hearsay and
15			hearsay because it is a party-opponent's	lack authentication.
16			statement. Fed. R.	
17	22		Evid. 801(d)(2).	77 10 1
18	33.	Audio Recording of Interview of Jake Adams (COSB001412)	Relevance, cumulative, waste	Yes if deemed admissible.
19		vane raams (COSBOOT 112)	time, and hearsay. Fed.	
20			R. Evid. 401-403, 802, 805.	
21				
22			Plaintiffs' Response: Adams's interview	
23			regarding the incident,	
24			given to detectives days after the incident	
25			are relevant as it is	
			closest in time recollection of the	
26			events, differs in some	
27			important details to his	
28			testimony given later,	

1	Ewhihi4	Description	Objection/Pagnanga	Ctinulation to
	Exhibit No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
2				and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4			and may also be used to impeach Adams's	
5			testimony. Moreover,	
6			the recording is not	
7			hearsay because it is a	
8			declarant-witness's prior statement. Fed.	
			R. Evid. 801(d)(2).	
9	34.	Report and Transcription of	Relevance,	No.
10		Interview of Jake Adams	cumulative, waste	Defs.' Reply:
11		(COSB000309-394)	time, hearsay, and	The report and
12			lacks foundation and authenticity. Fed. R.	transcription
13			Evid. 401-403, 602,	are someone else's
14			802, 805, 901.	interpretation
15			<b>Plaintiffs' Response</b> :	of what Adams
			Adams's interview	allegedly stated
16			regarding the incident, given to detectives	during his interview.
17			days after the incident	Further, the
18			are relevant as it is	accuracy of the
19			closest in time recollection of the	transcription is unknown and
20			events, differs in some	unverified. The
21			important details to his	
22			testimony given later, and may also be used	therefore inadmissible
			to impeach Adams's	hearsay and
23			testimony. Moreover,	lack
24			the recording is not	authentication.
25			hearsay because it is a declarant-witness's	
26			prior statement. Fed.	
27			R. Evid. 801(d)(2).	
				_

1	Ewhihi4	Description	Objection/Pagnange	Stinulation to
	Exhibit No.	<b>Description</b>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
2	1101			and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
$4 \parallel$	35.	Audio Recording of Interview of	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
5		Robert Vaccari (COSB001352)	cumulative, waste	admissible.
6			time, and hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403, 802,	
$\frac{1}{7}$			805.	
			Plaintiffs' Response:	
8			Vaccari's interview	
9			regarding the incident,	
10			given to detectives days after the incident	
11			are relevant as it is	
			closest in time	
12			recollection of the	
13			events, differs in some	
14			important details to his	
15			testimony given later, and may also be used	
			to impeach Vaccari's	
16			testimony. Moreover,	
17			the recording is not	
18			hearsay because it is a	
19			declarant-witness's prior statement. Fed.	
			R. Evid. 801(d)(2).	
20	36.	Audio Recording of Interview of	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
21	30.	Robert Vaccari (COSB001376)	cumulative, waste	admissible.
22			time, and hearsay. Fed.	
23			R. Evid. 401-403, 802, 805.	
24				
25			Plaintiffs' Response: Adams's interview	
			regarding the incident,	
26			given to detectives	
27			days after the incident	
28			are relevant as it is	

1	Exhibit	Description	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
2	No.			Authenticity
3				and Foundation
4			closest in time	
5			recollection of the	
			events, differs in some	
6			important details to his	
7			testimony given later, and may also be used	
8			to impeach Adams's	
9			testimony. Moreover,	
			the recording is not	
10			hearsay because it is a declarant-witness's	
11			prior statement. Fed.	
12			R. Evid. 801(d)(2).	
13	37.	Audio Recording of Interview of	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
14		Robert Vaccari (COSB001398)	cumulative, waste	admissible.
			time, and hearsay. Fed.	
15			R. Evid. 401-403, 802, 805.	
16			Plaintiffs' Response:	
17			Adams's interview	
18			regarding the incident,	
19			given to detectives	
20			days after the incident are relevant as it is	
			closest in time	
21			recollection of the	
22			events, differs in some	
23			important details to his testimony given later,	
24			and may also be used	
			to impeach Adams's	
25			testimony. Moreover,	
26			the recording is not	
27			hearsay because it is a declarant-witness's	
28	L	I		

1	<b>Exhibit</b>	Description	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
2	<u>No.</u>	<u> </u>	Objection Tesponse	<b>Authenticity</b>
				and E
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4   5			prior statement. Fed. R. Evid. 801(d)(2).	
6	38.	Audio Recording of Interview of Robert Vaccari (COSB001399)	Relevance, cumulative, waste	Yes if deemed admissible.
7		1100011 (00020010)	time, and hearsay. Fed.	
8			R. Evid. 401-403, 802, 805.	
9			Plaintiffs' Response:	
10			Adams's interview regarding the incident,	
11			given to detectives days after the incident	
13			are relevant as it is	
			closest in time recollection of the	
14			events, differs in some	
15			important details to his	
16			testimony given later, and may also be used	
17			to impeach Adams's	
18			testimony. Moreover,	
19			the recording is not hearsay because it is a	
20			declarant-witness's	
21			prior statement. Fed. R. Evid. 801(d)(2).	
22	39.	Audio Recording of Interview of	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
23		Robert Vaccari (COSB001400)	cumulative, waste time, and hearsay. Fed.	admissible.
24			R. Evid. 401-403, 802,	
25			805.	
26			Plaintiffs' Response: Adams's interview	
27			regarding the incident,	
28			given to detectives	

$_{1}\Vert$	<b>Exhibit</b>	Description	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
$_{2}\Vert$	No.			Authenticity
3				and Foundation
$4 \parallel$			days after the incident	-
5			are relevant as it is closest in time	
6			recollection of the	
7			events, differs in some	
8			important details to his testimony given later,	
9			and may also be used	
10			to impeach Adams's testimony. Moreover,	
11			the recording is not	
12			hearsay because it is a declarant-witness's	
			prior statement. Fed.	
13			R. Evid. 801(d)(2).	
14	40.	Report and Transcription of	Relevance,	No.
15		Interview of Robert Vaccari (COSB000214-307)	cumulative, waste time, hearsay, and	Defs.' Reply:
16			lacks foundation and	The report and transcription
17			authenticity. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403, 602,	are someone
18			802, 805, 901.	else's interpretation
19			<b>Plaintiffs' Response</b> :	of what
20			Adams's interview regarding the incident,	Vaccari allegedly stated
21			given to detectives	during his
22			days after the incident are relevant as it is	interview. Further, the
23			closest in time	accuracy of the
24			recollection of the	transcription is
25			events, differs in some important details to his	unknown and unverified. The
26			testimony given later,	documents are
27			and may also be used to impeach Adams's	therefore inadmissible
28			testimony. Moreover,	hearsay and
	_			

1	<b>Exhibit</b>	Description	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
2	No.			Authenticity
3				and Foundation
4 5			the recording is not hearsay because it is a	lack authentication.
6			declarant-witness's prior statement. Fed. R. Evid. 801(d)(2).	
7 8	41.	Audio Recording of Interview of Wendy Mangerino	Relevance, cumulative, waste	Yes if deemed admissible.
9		(COSB001356)	time, and hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403, 802,	
11			805	
12			Plaintiffs' Response: Mangerino's interview	
13			regarding the incident, given to detectives	
14			days after the incident are relevant as it is	
15			closest in time	
16			recollection of the events, and may also	
17 18			be used to impeach testimony.	
19	42.	Audio Recording of Interview of	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
20		Erin Mangerino (COSB009190)	cumulative, waste time, and hearsay. Fed.	admissible.
21			R. Evid. 401-403, 802,	
22			805 <b>Plaintiffs' Response</b> :	
23			Mangerino's interview	
24			regarding the incident, given to detectives	
25			days after the incident are relevant as it is	
26			closest in time	
27			recollection of the events, differs in some	
28		<u> </u>	Cronto, differs in some	

	<b>T</b>		014 / 7	
1	Exhibit No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
2	110.			and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4			important details to his	
5			testimony given later,	
6			and may also be used to impeach	
			Mangerino's	
7			testimony. Moreover,	
8			the recording is not	
9			hearsay because it is a declarant-witness's	
10			prior statement. Fed.	
11			R. Evid. 801(d)(2).	
12	43.	Audio Recording of Tammy	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
		Goodson (COSB001413)	cumulative, waste	admissible.
13			time, and hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403, 802,	
14			805	
15			Plaintiffs' Response:	
16			Goodson's interview	
17			regarding the incident, given to detectives	
18			days after the incident	
19			are relevant as it is	
			closest in time	
20			recollection of the events, differs in some	
21			important details to his	
22			testimony given later,	
23			and may also be used	
24			to impeach Goodson's testimony. Moreover,	
			the recording is not	
25			hearsay because it is a	
26			declarant-witness's prior statement. Fed.	
27			R. Evid. 801(d)(2).	
28				

1	E-bibit	Description	Objection/Degrange	Stimulation to
1	Exhibit No.	<b>Description</b>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
2	1101			and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4	44.	Audio Recording of Interview of	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
5		Tammy Goodson (COSB001414)	cumulative, waste	admissible.
6			time, and hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403, 802,	
$\frac{1}{7}$			805	
			Plaintiffs' Response:	
8			Goodson's interview	
9			regarding the incident,	
10			given to detectives days after the incident	
11			are relevant as it is	
			closest in time	
12			recollection of the	
13			events, differs in some	
14			important details to his	
15			testimony given later, and may also be used	
			to impeach Goodson's	
16			testimony. Moreover,	
17			the recording is not	
18			hearsay because it is a	
19			declarant-witness's prior statement. Fed.	
			R. Evid. 801(d)(2).	
20	45.	Audio Recording of Interview of	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
21		Jonathan Wayne Botten, Sr.	cumulative, waste	admissible.
22		(COSB1387)	time, more prejudicial	
23			than probative, and hearsay. Fed. R. Evid.	
24			401-403, 802, 805.	
25			Plaintiffs' Response:	
26			Botten's interview	
			regarding the incident, given to detectives	
27			days after the incident	
28			<i>j</i>	

1	Evhibit	<b>Description</b>	Objection/Pernance	<b>Stipulation to</b>
	No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	<b>Authenticity</b>
2	_			and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4			are relevant as it is closest in time	
5			recollection of the	
6			events and is not	
7			hearsay if used to	
8			show that his testimony is consistent	
9			with his prior	
			statements in order to	
10			rebut an express or implied charge that he	
11			recently fabricated it	
12			or acted from a recent	
13			improper influence or motive in so testify as	
14			Defendants have	
15			argued that he has a	
16			motive in testifying a certain way because he	
17			has brought a lawsuit	
			stemming from the	
18			same incident. Fed. R. Evid. 801(d)(1).	
19	46.	Audio Recording of Interview of	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
20	40.	Jonathan Wayne Botten, Sr.	cumulative, waste	admissible.
21		(COSB1388)	time, more prejudicial	
22			than probative, and hearsay. Fed. R. Evid.	
23			401-403, 802, 805.	
24			Violates Court's order	
25			regarding scope of	
			Botten testimony. (ECF No. 185 at 5.)	
26			Plaintiffs' Response:	
27			Botten's interview	
28			regarding the incident,	

-23-

1	Evhibit	<b>Description</b>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to
$\begin{vmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{vmatrix}$	No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	<b>Authenticity</b>
3				and Foundation
4			given to detectives	<u>roundation</u>
5			days after the incident	
			are relevant as it is	
6			closest in time recollection of the	
7			events and is not	
8			hearsay if used to	
9			show that his testimony is consistent	
10			with his prior	
11			statements in order to	
12			rebut an express or implied charge that he	
13			recently fabricated it	
14			or acted from a recent	
			improper influence or motive in so testify as	
15			Defendants have	
16			argued that he has a motive in testifying a	
17			certain way because he	
18			has brought a lawsuit	
19			stemming from the same incident. Fed. R.	
20			Evid. 801(d)(1).	
21	47.	Audio Recording of Interview of	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
22		Jonathan Wayne Botten, Sr. (COSB1389)	cumulative, waste time, more prejudicial	admissible.
23		(COSD1369)	than probative, and	
24			hearsay. Fed. R. Evid.	
25			401-403, 802, 805.	
26			Plaintiffs' Response: Botten's interview	
27			regarding the incident,	
			given to detectives	
28			days after the incident	

1	<b>Exhibit</b>	Description	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to
$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$	No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	<b>Authenticity</b>
				and
3			1	<b>Foundation</b>
4			are relevant as it is closest in time	
5			recollection of the	
6			events and is not	
7			hearsay if used to show that his	
8			testimony is consistent	
9			with his prior	
			statements in order to	
10			rebut an express or implied charge that he	
11			recently fabricated it	
12			or acted from a recent	
13			improper influence or motive in so testify as	
14			Defendants have	
15			argued that he has a	
16			motive in testifying a	
			certain way because he has brought a lawsuit	
17			stemming from the	
18			same incident. Fed. R.	
19			Evid. 801(d)(1).	
20	48.	Audio Recording of Interview of Jonathan Wayne Botten, Sr.	Relevance, cumulative, waste	Yes if deemed admissible.
21		(COSB1390)	time, more prejudicial	admissible.
22		,	than probative, and	
23			hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403, 802, 805.	
			Violates Court's order	
24			regarding scope of	
25			Botten testimony.	
26			(ECF No. 185 at 5.)	
27			Plaintiffs' Response: Botten's interview	
28			regarding the incident,	

	<b>T</b>			
1	Exhibit No	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to
2	No.			Authenticity and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4			given to detectives	
5			days after the incident are relevant as it is	
6			closest in time	
			recollection of the	
7			events and is not	
8			hearsay if used to	
9			show that his	
10			testimony is consistent with his prior	
			statements in order to	
11			rebut an express or	
12			implied charge that he	
13			recently fabricated it or acted from a recent	
14			improper influence or	
15			motive in so testify as	
			Defendants have	
16			argued that he has a	
17			motive in testifying a certain way because he	
18			has brought a lawsuit	
19			stemming from the	
			same incident. Fed. R.	
20			Evid. 801(d)(1).	
21	49.	Audio Recording of Interview of	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
22		Jonathan Wayne Botten, Sr. (COSB1391)	cumulative, waste time, more prejudicial	admissible.
23		(COSDIS71)	than probative, and	
24			hearsay. Fed. R. Evid.	
			401-403, 802, 805.	
25			Violates Court's order regarding scope of	
26			Botten testimony.	
27			(ECF No. 185 at 5.)	
28				J

1	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Description</b>	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
2	<u>No.</u>	<del>- 000</del>		Authenticity
3				and Foundation
			DI * 4*66 1 D	<b>Foundation</b>
4			Plaintiffs' Response: Botten's interview	
5			regarding the incident,	
6			given to detectives	
7			days after the incident	
			are relevant as it is	
8			closest in time	
9			recollection of the events and is not	
10			hearsay if used to	
11			show that his	
			testimony is consistent	
12			with his prior	
13			statements in order to rebut an express or	
14			implied charge that he	
15			recently fabricated it	
			or acted from a recent	
16			improper influence or	
17			motive in so testify as Defendants have	
18			argued that he has a	
19			motive in testifying a	
			certain way because he	
20			has brought a lawsuit	
21			stemming from the same incident. Fed. R.	
22			Evid. 801(d)(1).	
23	50.	Selected Scene Photographs	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
24		(COSB001472, 1477, 1478, 1482,	cumulative, waste	admissible.
		1487, 1489, 1492, 1493, 1498,	time, and more	
25		1499, 1500, 1557, 1558, 1561, 1562, 1571, 1602, 1838, 1830	prejudicial than	
26		1562, 1571, 1692, 1838, 1839, 1840, 1843, 1846, 1847, 1852,	probative. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403.	
27		1854, 1877, 1878, 1883, 1985,	2.14. 101 103.	
28		2090, 2093, 2095, 2098, 2099,		
20				

1	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Description</b>	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
	No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	<b>Authenticity</b>
2				and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4		2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2108,	Plaintiffs' Response:	
5		2111, 2113, 2115, 2119, 2122, 2126, 2128, 2134, 2135, 2137,	The photos are relevant and not	
6		2139, 2141, 2143, 2146, 2148,	cumulative as they	
		2152, 2227, 2232, 2349, 2350,	show important angles	
7		2352, 2353, 2354, 4238, 2439,	of the scene, including	
8		2440; AG0886-935, 966-985)	where the vehicles	
9			were positioned in relation to each other	
10			and the surrounding	
11			area, and where the	
			officers were in	
12			relation to the vehicles	
13			and surrounding scene at the time of the	
14			shooting.	
15	51.	Selected Aerial Photographs of	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
16		the Scene (COSB004198, 4199,	cumulative, waste	admissible.
17		4208, 4209, 4217, 4220, 4222, 4269, 4272, 4273, 4276, 4277,	time, and more prejudicial than	
		4278, 4285, 4286), 6734, 6735,	probative. Fed. R.	
18		8427, 8727, 8728; AG0674-680)	Evid. 401-403.	
19			<b>Plaintiffs' Response</b> :	
20			The photos are	
21			relevant and not cumulative as they	
22			show important angles	
			of the scene, including	
23			where the vehicles	
24			were positioned in relation to each other	
25			and the surrounding	
26			area, where the	
27			officers were in	
			relation to the vehicles	
28			and surrounding scene	

-28-

1	T1-:1-:4	Donovintion	Ohiastian/Damana	C4:1-4: 4-
$\frac{1}{2}$	Exhibit No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
2	1100			and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4			at the time of the	
5			shooting, and where the Botten house was	
6			in relation to the	
7			officers' positions at	
8			the time of the shooting.	
$\begin{vmatrix} 0 \\ 9 \end{vmatrix}$	52.	Selected Photographs from	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
	32.	Autopsy of Hector Puga	cumulative, waste	admissible.
10		(COSB002671 [redacted], 2688	time, and more	
11		[redacted], 2694, 2697 [redacted], 2698, 2702, 2703 [redacted], 2704	prejudicial than probative. Fed. R.	
12		[redacted], 2709, 2733 [redacted],	Evid. 401-403.	
13		2737, 2738, 2770, 2771, 2775,	(Objections made to	
14		2776, 2780, 2781, 2811, 2812, 2900, 2901)	preserve them but parties may have	
15		2500, 2501)	reached agreement.)	
16			Plaintiffs' Response:	
17			The photos are	
18			relevant to Decedent's damages. The	
			recovered bullets from	
19			Decedent's body are	
20			also relevant to liability as Kee and	
21			Blackwood had	
22			different caliber	
23			bullets from Rubalcava and there is	
24			one gunshot wound	
25			that is the main lethal wound.	
26	52	Dhotographs of Issiah Vas tales		Vos if doors d
27	53.	Photographs of Isaiah Kee taken after Incident (COSB004165-	Relevance, cumulative, waste	Yes if deemed admissible.
		,	time, and more	
28				

-29-

$_{1}\Vert$	Exhibit	Description	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
$_{2}\Vert$	No.			Authenticity
3				and Foundation
$4 \parallel$		4168; COSB004257-4258;	prejudicial than	
5		AG0531-536, 549-554)	probative. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403.	
6			Plaintiffs' Response:	
7			The photos are relevant to show that	
8			the possible	
9			alternatives the	
10			officers had on their belt and on their	
11			person at the time of	
12			the use of deadly force. They are also	
13			relevant to show that	
14			the officers did not sustain any injuries.	
15	54.	Photographs of Bernardo	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
16		Rubalcava and weapons taken after Incident (COSB004116-	cumulative, waste time, and more	admissible.
17		41201 AG0466-505)	prejudicial than	
18			probative. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403.	
19	55.	Photographs of Michael	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
20	55.	Blackwood taken after Incident	cumulative, waste	admissible.
21		(COSB004143, 4144, 4253-4256; AG0506-510, 521-520)	time, and more prejudicial than	
22		7100500 510, 521 520)	probative. Fed. R.	
23			Evid. 401-403.	
24			<u>Plaintiffs' Response</u> : The photos are	
25			relevant to show that	
26			the possible alternatives the	
27			officers had on their	
28			belt and on their	

$_{1}\Vert$	Exhibit	<b>Description</b>	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$	No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	<b>Authenticity</b>
$\begin{vmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \end{vmatrix}$				and Foundation
$_{4}\Vert$			person at the time of	
5			the use of deadly	
6			force. They are also relevant to show that	
7			the officers did not sustain any injuries.	
8	56.	Photographs of Jake Adams taken	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
9		after Incident (COSB004088,	cumulative, waste	admissible.
10		4115, 4142, 4169, 4223, 4224)	time, and more prejudicial than	
11			probative. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403.	
12			Plaintiffs' Response:	
13			The photos are	
14			relevant to show that the possible	
15			alternatives the	
16			officers had on their belt and on their	
17			person at the time of	
18			the use of deadly force. They are also	
19			relevant to show that	
20			the officers did not sustain any injuries.	
21	57.	Photographs of Robert Vaccari	Relevance,	Yes if deemed
22		taken after Incident	cumulative, waste	admissible.
23		(COSB004084-4087, 4227)	time, and more prejudicial than	
24			probative. Fed. R.	
25			Evid. 401-403.	
26			<u>Plaintiffs' Response</u> : The photos are	
27 28			relevant to show that the possible	

1	E 1.11.4	D : ()		G4. 1 4.
1	Exhibit No.	<b>Description</b>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
2	110.			and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4			alternatives the	
5			officers had on their belt and on their	
6			person at the time of	
7			the use of deadly force. They are also	
8			relevant to show that	
9			the officers did not sustain any injuries.	
10	58.	MAIT Supplemental Physical	None.	Yes.
11		Evidence Identification and Scene Diagram (AG095-0125)		
12	59.		None if Det. Ripley	Yes if deemed
13	39.	Scene Investigation Report by Detective Robert Ripley	testifies, otherwise	admissible.
14		(COSB000103-186)	lacks foundation, calls	
15			for expert opinion, hearsay, and lacks	
16			authentication. Fed. R.	
17			Evid. 602, 702, 802, 901.	
18			Plaintiffs' Response:	
19			Plaintiffs intend to call	
20			Detective Ripley to testify at trial.	
21	60.	San Bernardino County Sheriff's	None if Dr. Jong	Yes if deemed
22		Department Autopsy Protocol of Hector Puga (COSB000834-848)	testifies, otherwise lacks foundation, calls	admissible.
23			for expert opinion,	
24			hearsay, and lacks authentication. Fed. R.	
25			Evid. 602, 702, 802,	
26			901.	
27			<u>Plaintiffs' Response</u> : Plaintiffs intend to call	
28			1 minums intend to can	

-32-

$1 \parallel$	Exhibit	Description	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
2	No.	Description	Objection/ Response	<b>Authenticity</b>
3				and Foundation
			Du Jone to testify at	Foundation
4   5			Dr. Jong to testify at trial.	
6 7 8 9	61.	Family Photographs with Hector Puga (Pltf 0001-0039)	Relevance, cumulative, waste time, more prejudicial than probative, and lacks foundation and authentication. Fed. R.	No.
10			Evid. 401-403, 602, and 901.	
11			Plaintiffs Response:	
12 13			These photos are relevant to damages.	
$13 \parallel 14 \parallel$	62.	Funeral and Burial Expenses (Plft	Relevance, more	No.
15		0040-0043)	prejudicial than probative, and lacks	
16			foundation and	
17			authentication. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403, 602,	
18			and 901.	
19			<u>Plaintiffs Response</u> : These expenses are	
20			relevant to damages	
21			and will be authenticated by a	
22			witness.	
23	63.	Photographs of Items Bought for	Relevance,	No.
24		Plaintiff A.L. by Hector Puga (Pltf 0061-62)	cumulative, waste time, more prejudicial	
25		,	than probative, and	
26			lacks foundation and authentication. Fed. R.	
27			Evid. 401-403, 602, and 901.	
28			und 701.	

				~
1	Exhibit No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to
2	No.			Authenticity and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4			<u>Plaintiffs Response</u> :	
5			These photos are relevant to damages	
6			and foundation/	
7			authentication will be	
8			established by a proper witness.	
9	64.	Paystubs for Hector J. Puga (Pltf	Relevance,	No.
10		0199-202)	cumulative, waste time, more prejudicial	
11   12			than probative, and lacks foundation and	
13			authentication. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403, 602,	
14			and 901.	
15			Plaintiffs Response:	
16			These paystubs are relevant to damages	
17			and foundation/	
18			authentication will be established by a proper	
19			witness.	
20	65.	Hector Puga Facebook Post re Plaintiff L.C. (Pltf 0229)	Relevance, cumulative, waste	No.
21		1 Iumim E.C. (1 iti 0225)	time, more prejudicial	
22			than probative, and lacks foundation and	
23			authentication. Fed. R.	
24			Evid. 401-403, 602, and 901.	
25			Plaintiffs Response:	
26			These posts are	
27			relevant to damages and foundation/	
28			authentication will be	

-34-

Exhibit No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity and Foundation
		established by a proper witness.	
66.	Hector Puga Facebook Post re Plaintiff A.L. (Pltf 0230-232)	Relevance, cumulative, waste time, more prejudicial than probative, and lacks foundation and authentication. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403, 602, and 901.	No.
		Plaintiffs Response: These posts are relevant to damages and foundation/ authentication will be established by a proper witness.	
67.	Hector Puga Facebook Post re Plaintiff I.H. (0233-236)	Relevance, cumulative, waste time, more prejudicial than probative, and lacks foundation and authentication. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403, 602, and 901.	No.
		Plaintiffs Response: These posts are relevant to damages and foundation/ authentication will be established by a proper	
68.	Hector Puga Facebook Post re Lidia Lopez (Pltf 0237-240)	witness.  Relevance, cumulative, waste	No.

1	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Description</b>	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
2	<u>No.</u>			<b>Authenticity</b> and
3				Foundation
4			time, more prejudicial than probative, and	
5			lacks foundation and authentication. Fed. R.	
6 7			Evid. 401-403, 602,	
8			and 901.  Plaintiffs Response:	
9			These posts are	
10			relevant to damages and foundation/	
11			authentication will be	
12			established by a proper witness.	
13	69.	LabCorp DNA Testing of	Calls for expert	No.
14   15		Plaintiffs L.C., I.H., and A.L. (Plaintiff 0243-245)	opinion, hearsay, and lacks foundation and	
16			authentication. Fed. R. Evid. 602, 702, 802,	
17			901.	
18			Plaintiffs' Response: A witness may be	
19			called to lay	
20			foundation and authenticate and testify	
21			to its results if needed.	
22	70.	Video of Hector Puga FaceTiming with Plaintiff A.L. (Plaintiff 0255)	· ·	No.
23		,	time, more prejudicial	
24			than probative, and lacks foundation and	
25			authentication. Fed. R.	
26			Evid. 401-403, 602, and 901.	
27				

	T 1 11 14	D		
1	Exhibit No.	<b>Description</b>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
2	1100			and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4			<u>Plaintiffs Response</u> :	
5			This video is relevant to damages and	
6			foundation/	
7			authentication will be	
8			established by a proper witness.	
9	71.	Black and White Surveillance	Relevance,	No.
10		Video (PLTFS 00345)	cumulative, waste time, more prejudicial	
11			than probative, lacks foundation and	
12			authentication, and	
13			untimely disclosure	
14			without substantial justification. Fed. R.	
15			Evid. 401-403, 602,	
16			and 901; Fed. R. Civ.	
17			P. 37.	
18			Plaintiffs' Response: The Court has ruled	
19			that this video may	
			come into evidence. It provides an angle of	
20			the shooting that no	
21			other video shows.	
22			Authenticity and foundation will be	
23			established through a	
24			proper witness at trial.	
25	72.	Exhibits 72-100 reserved for		
26	***	Plaintiffs  CTATE DEFENDANTS:	***	***
27	***	STATE DEFENDANTS' EXHIBIT LIST	ጥጥጥ	<u>ጥጥ</u> ጥ
28				

	T 1014	I D	O1: /: /D	
$1 \mid$	Exhibit No.	<b>Description</b>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
2	110.			and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4	101.	Rifle Cartridge, Puga's pistol and	Plaintiffs'	
5		cartridge, unfired catridge, Puga's Pistol and FCC [COSB001622-COSB001629,	Objections:	
6		COSB002041- COSB002044]	Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 403 – Relevance	
7		-	– information re	
8			alleged gun found next	
9			to Puga not known to officers at the time of	
10			the incident; Wasting	
11			time; Undue delay; Misleading/confusing	
12			of issues; Probative	
13			value outweighed by prejudice.	
			Defs.' Response:	
14			Defendants will testify	
15			about and identify the	
16			gun they saw in decedent's possession	
17			immediately before	
18			they fired or returned fire.	
19	102.	Puga's Vehicle, Inside Puga's	Plaintiffs'	
20	102.	Vehicle [COSB001898,	Objections:	
21		COSB001899- COSB001957]	Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
22			402, 403 – Relevance – information not	
23			known to the officer at	
24			the time of the	
25			incident; Wasting time; Undue delay;	
26			Misleading/confusing	
27			of issues; Probative value outweighed by	
28			prejudice; Cumulative.	

1	Ewhihit	Decemination	Objection/Pagnange	Stimulation to
1	Exhibit No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to Authenticity</b>
2				and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4			D.C. I D.	
5			Defs.' Response: Defendants will testify	
6			about their	
7			observations of decedent throwing	
8			various objects out of	
9			his vehicle during the	
10	10.5	N. 1.1.1	standoff.	
11	103.	Modelo beer can [COSB002012-COSB002014]	Plaintiffs' Objections:	
12			Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
13			402, 403 - Wasting	
14			time; Undue delay; Misleading/confusing	
15			of issues; Probative	
			value outweighed by	
16			prejudice.	
17				
18			Defs.' Response: Defendants will testify	
19			about their	
20			observations of	
21			decedent throwing various objects out of	
22			his vehicle during the	
23		10 1 (2) ( 1 1 1	standoff.	
24	104.	18 pack of Modelo beer [COSB002549-COSB002550]	Plaintiffs' Objections:	
25			Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
26			402, 403 – Relevance;	
27			Wasting time; Undue delay;	
28			Misleading/confusing	

1	Exhibit	Description	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
$\begin{vmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{vmatrix}$	<u>No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	<b>Authenticity</b>
3				and Foundation
4			of issues; Probative	
5			value outweighed by prejudice; Cumulative.	
6			projuuree, cumuruur.e.	
7			Defs.' Response:	
8			Defendants will testify	
9			about their observations of	
10			decedent throwing various objects out of	
11			his vehicle during the	
12			standoff.	
13	105.	Kee's Mobile Video Audio Recording System (MVARS),	<u>Plaintiffs'</u> <u>Objections</u> :	
14		Part 1 [AG0815]	Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
15			402, 403 – Relevance;	
16			Wasting time; cumulative of other	
17			evidence; probative	
18			value is outweighed by prejudice.	
19				
20			Defs.' Response:	
21			Relevant to the totality of the circumstances	
22			of Defendants'	
23			encounter with decedent, including his	
24			dangerous and erratic	
25			driving in an attempt to evade arrest.	
26	106.	Kee's MVARS, Part 2 [AG0816]		Plaintiffs
27				stipulate to authenticity
28				aumenticity

-40-

1	Ebibi4	Description	Objection/Degrange	Ctinulation to
$\frac{1}{2}$	Exhibit No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
2				and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4				and foundation if admitted.
5	107	W . MUADO D . 2 [A C0017]	Thi 1 4100 1	ii adiiitted.
6	107.	Kee's MVARS, Part 3 [AG0817]	Plaintiffs' Objections:	
7			Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
8			402, 403 – Wasting time; cumulative of	
9			other evidence;	
10			probative value is	
11			outweighed by prejudice.	
12			Defs.' Response:	
13			Relevant to the totality	
14			of the circumstances of Defendants'	
15			encounter with	
16			decedent, including his dangerous and erratic	
17			driving in an attempt	
18			to evade arrest.	
19	108.	Blackwood's MVARS, Part 1	Plaintiffs'	
		[AG0811]	Objections:	
20			Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 403 – Wasting	
21			time; cumulative of	
22			other evidence;	
23			probative value is outweighed by	
24			prejudice.	
25			Defs.' Response:	
26			Relevant to the totality of the circumstances	
27			of Defendants'	
28			encounter with	

-41-

$_{1}\Vert$	<b>Exhibit</b>	Description	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$	No.	Description	Objection/ Response	<b>Authenticity</b>
3				and Foundation
4			decedent, including his	
5			dangerous and erratic	
6			driving in an attempt to evade arrest.	
7	109.	Blackwood's MVARS, Part 2	Plaintiffs'	
8		[AG0812]	Objections:	
9			Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 403 – Wasting	
10			time; cumulative of other evidence;	
11			probative value is	
12			outweighed by prejudice.	
13			Defs.' Response:	
14			Relevant to the totality	
15			of the circumstances of Defendants'	
16			encounter with	
17			decedent, including his dangerous and erratic	
18			driving in an attempt	
19			to evade arrest.	
20	110.	Blackwood's MVARS, Part 3 [AG0813]	Plaintiffs' Objections:	
21			Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
22			402, 403 – Wasting	
23			time; cumulative of other evidence;	
24			probative value is	
25			outweighed by prejudice.	
26			Defs.' Response:	
27			Relevant to the totality	
28			of the circumstances	

-42-

1	T-lili	Dogovintion	Ohiostica / Domono	C4:1-4: 4-
1	Exhibit No.	<b>Description</b>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
2	1100			and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4			of Defendants'	
5			encounter with decedent, including his	
6			dangerous and erratic	
7			driving in an attempt	
8			to evade arrest.	
	111.	Blackwood's MVARS, Part 4		Plaintiffs stimulate to
9		[AG0814]		stipulate to authenticity
10				and foundation
11				if admitted.
12	112.	Blackwood's MVARS, Part 5	Plaintiffs'	
13		[AG01377]	Objections:	
14			Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 403 – Wasting	
15			time; cumulative of	
16			other evidence;	
			probative value is outweighed by	
17			prejudice.	
18			<b>Defs.' Response:</b>	
19			Relevant to the totality	
20			of the circumstances of Defendants'	
21			encounter with	
22			decedent, including	
23			Defendants' actions after the shooting	
24			ended.	
25	113.	Edward Mangerino's cellphone	Plaintiffs'	
26		footage [COSB001417 to	Objections:	
		COSB001461]	Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
27			402, 403 – Relevance; wasting time;	
28		<u> </u>	washing hille,	

-43-

1	<b>Exhibit</b>	Description	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$	No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Authenticity
				and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4			cumulative of other evidence.	
5			Defs.' Response:	
6			Relevant to the totality	
7			of the circumstances of Defendants'	
8			encounter with	
9			decedent. Witness	
10			recorded the standoff, captured decedent's	
11			and Kee's statements,	
12			and shows the deescalation measures	
13			officers attempted.	
14	114.	Erin Mangerino's cellphone		Plaintiffs
15		footage [COSB001416]		stipulate to authenticity
16				and foundation
17				if admitted.
18	115.	CHP Dispatch Audio [AG0451-AG0452]	Plaintiffs' Objections:	
19			Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
20			402, 403 – Relevance;	
21			probative value outweighed by	
22			prejudice; 801, 802 –	
23			Hearsay for which no	
24			exception applies.	
25			Defs.' Response: Relevant to the totality	
			of the circumstances	
26			of Defendants' encounter with	
27			decedent, including his	
28				

-44-

1	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Description</b>	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
$\begin{vmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{vmatrix}$	No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Authenticity
3				and Foundation
4			dangerous and erratic	Toundation
5			driving in an attempt	
6			to evade arrest and the officers' state of mind	
7			based on their reports	
8			to dispatch as the events unfolded.	
9	116.	OIS Incident Detail Report No.	Plaintiffs'	
10	110.	210217BS00009 [AG0318-	Objections:	
11		AG0331]	Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
			402, 403 – Relevance; probative value	
12			outweighed by	
13			prejudice; 801, 802 – Hearsay for which no	
14			exception applies.	
15			Defs.' Response:	
16			Relevant to the totality of the circumstances	
17			of Defendants'	
18			encounter with decedent. The incident	
19			report details	
20			Defendants' reporting of the events as they	
21			unfolded.	
22	117.	Freeway Shooting Incident Detail	Plaintiffs'	
23		Report No. 210216BS00186 [AG0332-AG0337]	Objections:	
24		[[1100332 1100331]	Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 403 – Relevance;	
25			misleading/confusing	
26			issues; undue delay; wasting time;	
27			probative value	
28				

-45-

1	T 1 1 1 14	D	OI: 4: /P	
1	Exhibit No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
2	110.			and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4			outweighed by	
5			prejudice; 801, 802 – Hearsay for which no	
6			exception applies.	
			Defs.' Response:	
7			Relevant to the totality	
8			of the circumstances	
9			of Defendants'	
10			encounter with	
			decedent, including Defendants'	
11			knowledge of	
12			decedent's suspected	
13			involvement in a	
14			dangerous felony	
			involving a firearm the	
15			day before the incident.	
16	118.	CHP Arrest-Investigation Report	Plaintiffs'	
17	110.	(CHP 216), No. F03885021	Objections:	
18		[AG0241 to AG0260]	Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
19			402, 403 – Relevance;	
20			probative value outweighed by	
21			prejudice; 801, 802 –	
			Hearsay for which no	
22			exception applies.	
23			Defs.' Response:	
24			Relevant to the totality	
25			of the circumstances of Defendants'	
26			encounter with	
			decedent, including	
27			Defendants'	
28			knowledge of	

1	T1:1:4	Description	Ohiostian/Damana	C4:lo4:4
1	Exhibit No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
2	1100			and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4			decedent's suspected involvement in a	
5			dangerous felony	
6			involving a firearm the day before the	
7			incident.	
8	119.	SB County Fire Department	Plaintiffs'	
9		MA22 Run Sheet for Hector Puga	<b>Objections</b> :	
10		[AG0380-AG0381]	Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 403 – Relevance;	
11			probative value	
12			outweighed by prejudice; 801, 802 –	
13			Hearsay for which no	
14			exception applies.	
15			Defs.' Response:	
16			Relevant to the testimony of	
17			paramedic Jeremy	
18			Pendergraft who pronounced decedent	
19			dead at the scene and	
20			observed his injuries.	
21	120.	Puga Facebook Post, Dec. 20, 2020 [AG0423]	Plaintiffs' Objections:	
22			Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
23			402, 403 – Relevance;	
24			probative value outweighed by	
25			prejudice; 801, 802 – Hearsay for which no	
26			exception applies.	
27			Defs.' Response:	
28			Decedent's online	

-47-

1	Exhibit	Description	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
2	No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Authenticity
3				and Foundation
4			posts are party admissions (Fed. R.	
5			Evid. 801(d)(2)) and	
6			statements against interest (Fed. R. Evid.	
7			804(b)(3)).	
8	121.	Photographs AG0456-AG0465,	Plaintiffs'	
9		AG0466-AG0510, AG0531- AG0536, AG0591-AG0593,	Objections:	
10		AG0606-AG0607, AG0646,	Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 403 – Relevance;	
11   12		AG0818, AG0863, AG0867, AG0870, AG0904, AG0915,	Wasting time; Undue delay;	
13		AG0917, AG0926, AG0930, AG0954, AG0976, AG0981-	Misleading/confusing	
14		AG0983, AG01032, AG01036	of issues; Probative value outweighed by	
15			prejudice; Cumulative.	
16			Defs.' Response: The	
17			photos are relevant and not cumulative.	
18			The photos of the	
19			bullets found in decedent's pockets and	
20			vehicle make it more	
21			likely that he was in possession of a gun.	
22			The bullet fragments	
			taken from his body are relevant to show	
23			the source of the	
24			gunshot wound. The	
25			photos of the beer cans in the vehicle and	
26			street are relevant to	
27			show decedent has	
28			been drinking and	

$_{1}\Vert$	Exhibit	<b>Description</b>	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
$_{2}\Vert$	No.			Authenticity
3				and Foundation
4			Defendants observed	
5			decedent throw the beer cans out his car	
6			window, which is	
7			consistent with the	
8			Court's ruling. (ECF No. 185 at 8, fn. 6.)	
$\begin{vmatrix} 0 \\ 9 \end{vmatrix}$			And photos of the	
			location of certain	
10			houses and vehicles are relevant to show	
11			important angles of the	
12			scene, including where the witnesses were	
13			located when the	
14			incident occurred.	
15	122.	CHP Aerial Screenshots		Plaintiffs
16		[AG0674-AG0680]		stipulate to authenticity
17				and foundation
18				if admitted.
19	123.	Original gun found on Puga (placeholder)	<u>Plaintiffs'</u> Objections:	
20		•	Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
21			402, 403 – Probative	
22			value outweighed by prejudice.	
23			<b>Defs.' Response:</b> The	
24			gun is relevant and	
25			highly probative because the jury can	
26			determine whether a	
27			reasonable officer	
			would felt they were imminent threat of	
28		<u> </u>	minimical anoat of	

-49-

1	<b>Exhibit</b>	Description	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to
$\begin{vmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{vmatrix}$	<u>No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	<b>Authenticity</b>
3				and Foundation
4			death or serious bodily	
5			injury if such a gun	
6			were waived and shot at them.	
7	124.	Toxicology Report [AG0142-	Plaintiffs'	
8		AG0144]	Objections: Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
9			402, 403 – Relevance	
10			- results not known to officers at the time of	
11			the incident; Probative	
12			value outweighed by prejudice; 801, 802 –	
13			Hearsay for which no	
14			exception applies; 901  – authenticity and	
15			foundation not yet	
16			established.	
17			<b>Defs.' Response:</b> The	
18			report is relevant to Defendants' "suicide	
19			by cop" theory and to	
20			confirm Defendants' observation that	
21			decedent was drinking	
22			alcohol and likely inebriated. (ECF No.	
23			185 at 7-8.)	
24	125.	CHP Use of Force Policy v12-	Plaintiffs'	
25		2020 [AG01557-AG01578]	Objections:	
26			Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 403 – Relevance;	
27			probative value	
28			outweighed by	

1	<b>Exhibit</b>	Description	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to
$_{2}\Vert$	No.			Authenticity
3				and Foundation
4			prejudice; 801, 802 –	
5			Hearsay for which no exception applies.	
6			<b>Defs.' Response:</b> The	
7			use-of-force policy is	
8			relevant to Defendants' police-	
9			practices expert's	
10			testimony and Defendants' testimony	
11			regarding the force	
12	126	D111 T1	used.	
13	126.	Blackwood Training Records [AG0184-AG0199]	Plaintiffs' Objections:	
14			Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
15			402, 403 – Relevance; prejudicial, confusing.	
16			Defs.' Response:	
17			These records are	
18			relevant to show Defendant's training	
19			on the use-of-force	
20			and firearms and to rebut the anticipated	
21			testimony of Plaintiffs'	
22			police-practices expert.	
23	127.	Kee's Training Records	Plaintiffs'	
24		[AG0200-AG0228]	Objections:	
25			Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
26			402, 403 – Relevance; prejudicial, confusing.	
27			<b>Defs.' Response:</b>	
28			These records are	

1	<b>Exhibit</b>	Description	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to
2	No.			Authenticity
3				and Foundation
4			relevant to show	
5			Defendant's training on the use-of-force	
6			and firearms and to	
7			rebut the anticipated	
8			testimony of Plaintiffs' police-practices	
9			expert.	
10	128.	Rubalcava's Training Records [AG0229-AG0240]	Plaintiffs' Objections:	
11			Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
12			402, 403 – Relevance;	
13			prejudicial, confusing.	
14			Defs.' Response: These records are	
15			relevant to show	
16			Defendant's training on the use-of-force	
17			and firearms and to	
18			rebut the anticipated testimony of Plaintiffs'	
19			police-practices	
20	120	Annabelle Botten's 911 Calls re:	expert.	
21	129.	Suspect with Gun—Redacted	Plaintiffs' Objections:	
22		[COSB001364]	Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
23			402, 403 – Relevance;	
24			Wasting time; Undue delay;	
25			Misleading/confusing	
26			of issues; Probative value outweighed by	
27			prejudice; Cumulative;	
28			801, 802 – Hearsay for	

-52-

$_{1}\Vert$	Ewhihit	Description	Objection/Pagnonga	Stipulation to
	Exhibit No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
$\frac{2}{2}$	_			and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4			which no exception applies.	
5			Defs.' Response:	
6			Botten's statements to	
7			the dispatch operator	
8			regarding the incident, including what she	
9			saw, are relevant as	
10			they are closest in time recollection of the	
11			events, and may also	
12			be used to impeach her testimony if it	
13			subsequently differs.	
14			Moreover, the	
15			recording is not hearsay because it is a	
16			declarant-witness's	
			prior statement. Fed.	
17	130.	Audio recorded interview of	R. Evid. 801(d)(2).	
18	130.	Annabelle Botten, conducted on	<u>Plaintiffs'</u> <u>Objections</u> :	
19		February 17, 2021, at 10:11 a.m.	Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
20		by Detective Hernandez of the San Bernardino County Sheriff's	402, 403 – Relevance;	
21		Office—Redacted	Wasting time; Undue delay;	
22		[COSB001379]	Misleading/confusing	
23			of issues; Probative	
24			value outweighed by prejudice; Cumulative;	
25			801, 802 – Hearsay for	
26			which no exception applies.	
27			Defs.' Response:	
28			Botten's statements to	

-53-

1	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Description</b>	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
2	<u>No.</u>			<b>Authenticity</b> and
3				Foundation
4			the investigators	
5			regarding the incident, including what she	
6			saw, are relevant as	
7			they are closest in time recollection of the	
8			events, and may also	
9			be used to impeach her	
10			testimony if it subsequently differs.	
11			Moreover, the	
12			recording is not hearsay because it is a	
13			declarant-witness's	
			prior statement. Fed.	
14			R. Evid. 801(d)(2).	
15	131.	Greg Meyer's Curriculum Vitae/Resume	Plaintiffs' Objections:	
16			Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
17			402, 403 – Relevance;	
18			Probative value outweighed by	
19			prejudice; 801, 802 –	
20			Hearsay for which no	
21			exception applies.  Defs.' Response: The	
22			expert's credentials are	
23			relevant and necessary	
24			to be allowed to testify as an expert, and are	
25			necessary for the jury	
26			to determine what weight to give the	
27			witness' testimony.	
28				

1	Exhibit	Description	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
$\begin{vmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{vmatrix}$	<u>No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	Objection Response	<b>Authenticity</b>
3				and Foundation
4	132.	Greg Meyer's Expert Report and	Plaintiffs'	<u>r vanuation</u>
5	132.	Supporting Material	Objections:	
			Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
6 7			402, 403 – Relevance; Probative value	
			outweighed by	
8			prejudice; 801, 802 –	
9			Hearsay for which no exception applies.	
10			Defs.' Response:	
11			Defendants do not	
12			intend to admit the report or supporting	
13			material into evidence,	
14			but may use it to aid the witness or refresh	
15			recollection.	
16	133.	Lucien C. Haag's Curriculum	Plaintiffs'	
17		Vitae/Resume	Objections:	
18			Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 403 – Relevance;	
19			Probative value	
20			outweighed by prejudice; 801, 802 –	
21			Hearsay for which no	
22			exception applies.	
23			<b><u>Defs.' Response</u>:</b> The expert's credentials are	
24			relevant and necessary	
25			to be allowed to testify	
26			as an expert, and are necessary for the jury	
27			to determine what	

1	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Description</b>	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
2	<u>No.</u>			Authenticity
3				and Foundation
4 5			weight to give the witness' testimony.	
6	134.	Lucien C. Haag's Expert Report	Plaintiffs' Objections:	
7			Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 403 – Relevance;	
8 9			Probative value outweighed by	
10			prejudice; 801, 802 – Hearsay for which no	
11			exception applies.	
12			<u>Defs.' Response</u> :	
13			Defendants do not intend to admit the	
14			report or supporting	
15			material into evidence, but may use it to aid	
16			the witness or refresh	
17			recollection.	
18	135.	Alexander Jason's Curriculum Vitae/Resume	Plaintiffs' Objections:	
19			Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
20			402, 403 – Relevance; Probative value	
21			outweighed by	
22			prejudice; 801, 802 – Hearsay for which no	
23			exception applies.	
24			<b>Defs.' Response</b> : The	
25			expert's credentials are relevant and necessary	
26			to be allowed to testify	
27			as an expert, and are necessary for the jury	
28			necessary for the jury	

$_{1}\Vert$	<b>Exhibit</b>	Description	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
2	No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	<b>Authenticity</b>
$\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}$				and Foundation
			to determine what	<u>roundation</u>
5			weight to give the witness' testimony.	
6	136.	Alexander Jason's Expert Report	Plaintiffs'	
7			Objections:	
8			Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 403 – Relevance;	
9			Probative value outweighed by	
10			prejudice; 801, 802 –	
12			Hearsay for which no exception applies.	
13			<b>Defs.' Response:</b>	
14			Defendants do not intend to admit the	
15			report or supporting	
16			material into evidence,	
17			but may use it to aid the witness or refresh	
			recollection.	
18 19	137.	Kris Mohandie's Curriculum	Plaintiffs'	
		Vitae/Resume	Objections:	
20			Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 403 – Relevance;	
21			Probative value	
22			outweighed by	
23			prejudice; 801, 802 – Hearsay for which no	
24			exception applies.	
25			<b><u>Defs.' Response</u>:</b> The	
26			expert's credentials are relevant and necessary	
27			to be allowed to testify	
28			as an expert, and are	

1	<b>Exhibit</b>	Description	Objection/ Response	<b>Stipulation to</b>
$\begin{vmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{vmatrix}$	No.	Description	Objection Response	<b>Authenticity</b>
3				and Foundation
4			necessary for the jury	
5			to determine what	
6			weight to give the witness' testimony.	
7	138.	Kris Mohandie's Expert Report	Plaintiffs'	
8			Objections:	
9			Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 403 – Relevance;	
10			Probative value outweighed by	
11			prejudice; 801, 802 –	
12			Hearsay for which no exception applies.	
13			Defs.' Response:	
14			Defendants do not	
15			intend to admit the report or supporting	
16			material into evidence,	
17			but may use it to aid the witness or refresh	
18			recollection.	
19	139.	Richard Franklin Clark, Jr.'s Curriculum Vitae/Resume	Plaintiffs'	
20		Curriculum vitae/Resume	Objections: Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
21			402, 403 – Relevance;	
22			Probative value outweighed by	
23			prejudice; 801, 802 –	
24			Hearsay for which no exception applies.	
25			<b>Defs.' Response:</b> The	
26			expert's credentials are	
27			relevant and necessary to be allowed to testify	
28		<u> </u>	to be allowed to testify	

$_{1}\Vert$	Exhibit	<b>Description</b>	Objection/Pagnonge	<b>Stipulation to</b>
	No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Authenticity
$\frac{2}{2}$	_			and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4 5 6			as an expert, and are necessary for the jury to determine what weight to give the	
7			witness' testimony.	
8	140.	Richard Franklin Clark, Jr.'s Expert Report	<u>Plaintiffs'</u> <u>Objections</u> :	
9			Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
10			402, 403 – Relevance; Probative value	
11 12			outweighed by prejudice; 801, 802 –	
13			Hearsay for which no exception applies	
14			Defs.' Response:	
15			Defendants do not	
16			intend to admit the report or supporting	
17			material into evidence,	
18			but may use it to aid the witness or refresh	
19			recollection.	
20	141.	Joshua Peter Visco's Curriculum Vitae/Resume	Plaintiffs' Objections:	
21		vitae/Resume	Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
22			402, 403 – Relevance;	
23			Probative value outweighed by	
24			prejudice; 801, 802 –	
25			Hearsay for which no exception applies.	
26			<b>Defs.' Response:</b> The	
27			expert's credentials are	
28			relevant and necessary	

1	Ebib:4	Description	Objection/Degrange	Ctimulation to
1	Exhibit No.	<b>Description</b>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
2	1101			and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4			to be allowed to testify	
5			as an expert, and are	
6			necessary for the jury to determine what	
			weight to give the	
7			witness' testimony.	
8	142.	Joshua Peter Visco's Expert	Plaintiffs'	
9		Report	Objections:	
10			Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 403 – Relevance;	
11			Probative value	
12			outweighed by	
13			prejudice; 801, 802 – Hearsay for which no	
14			exception applies.	
15			<b>Defs.' Response:</b>	
16			Defendants do not intend to admit the	
17			report or supporting	
			material into evidence,	
18			but may use it to aid	
19			the witness or refresh recollection.	
20	143.	Birth Certificate of L.C. [Plaintiff	Plaintiffs'	
21		0153]	<b>Objections</b> :	
22			Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
23			402, 403 – Relevance;	
24			Probative value outweighed by	
25			prejudice. Fed. R. Evid. 801, 802 –	
26			Hearsay.	
27			<b>Defs.' Response:</b> The	
28			document is relevant	

$_{1}\Vert$	Ewhihit	Degazintion	Objection/Pagnonge	Stinulation to
	Exhibit No.	<u>Description</u>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity
2				and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4   5			to standing and damages, including	
6			lack of paternity and decedent's	
7			failure/refusal to be listed as the Plaintiff's	
8			father.	
9	144.	Birth Certificate of I.H. [Plaintiff 0099]	Plaintiffs' Objections:	
10			Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
11   12			402, 403 – Relevance; Probative value	
13			outweighed by	
14			prejudice. Fed. R. Evid. 801, 802 –	
15			Hearsay.	
16			<u>Defs.' Response</u> : The document is relevant	
17			to standing and damages, including	
18			lack of paternity and	
19			decedent's failure/refusal to be	
20			listed as the Plaintiff's	
21			father.	
22	145.	Birth Certificate of A.L. [Plaintiff 0054]	Plaintiffs' Objections:	
23			Fed. R. Evid. 401,	
24			402, 403 – Relevance;	
25			Probative value outweighed by	
26			prejudice. Fed. R.	
27			Evid. 801, 802 – Hearsay.	
28				

## Case 5:22-cv-00949-KK-SHK Document 190 Filed 05/16/25 Page 63 of 63 Page ID #:4546

1 2	Exhibit No.	<b>Description</b>	Objection/ Response	Stipulation to Authenticity and
3				<b>Foundation</b>
4			<b>Defs.' Response:</b> The	
5			document is relevant to standing and	
6			damages, including	
7			lack of paternity and decedent's	
8			failure/refusal to be	
9			listed as the Plaintiff's father.	
10	146.	Exhibits 147-200 reserved for		
11		State Defendants		
12				